

DT 933

.P51

41
29
DT 933

.P51

Copy 1

R. F. Pettigrew 5000
S. F. R.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN REPUBLIC.

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD F. PETTIGREW,
OF SOUTH DAKOTA,

IN THE

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

SATURDAY, APRIL 14, 1900.

WASHINGTON.

1900.

H. K. S.



P.

Cong. Record Off.]

10 Ja. '01

DT 933
p51

The South African Republic.

SPEECH OF HON. RICHARD F. PETTIGREW.

[From the Congressional Record of April 14, 1900.]

Mr. PETTIGREW. I ask that my resolution may be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays the resolution before the Senate.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. PETTIGREW February 2, 1900, as follows:

Whereas from the hour of achieving their own independence the people of the United States have regarded with sympathy the struggles of other people to free themselves from European domination: Therefore,

Resolved, That we watch with deep and abiding interest the heroic battle of the South African Republic against cruelty and oppression, and our best hopes go out for the full success of their determined contest for liberty.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, it is my opinion that the Senate should pass this resolution of sympathy for the people of South Africa. If we do not, it will be the first time in our history as a Republic that we have failed to express our sympathy and interest, in emphatic terms, for any race or people whatever who were striving to maintain free institutions.

We are parties to the agreement resulting from the conference at The Hague last year; and while I do not believe that America should take up the quarrels of other nations or become complicated in European controversies, it does not appear to me that the Administration has made an honest effort in good faith to comply with and carry out the terms of The Hague agreement. For that agreement provided—

TITLE SECOND.—*Or friendly offices and mediation.*

ART. 2. In case of serious dissension or of conflict, before the appeal to arms, the signatory powers agree to have recourse, as far as circumstances will permit, to the friendly offices or to the mediation of one or of several friendly powers.

ART. 3. Independently of this resort, the signatory powers think it to be useful that one or more powers who have no part in the conflict may offer of their own volition, so far as circumstances may make it appropriate, their friendly offices or their mediation to the states engaged in the conflict. The right to offer these friendly offices or mediation is absolute in the powers which take no part in the conflict even during hostilities. The exercise of this right shall never be considered by either of the parties to the contest as an unfriendly act.

ART. 4. The duty of a mediator consists in conciliating the opposing claims and appeasing the resentment which may have sprung up between the states engaged in the conflict.

ART. 5. The duties of a mediator cease from the moment when it is officially declared by either party to the strife, or by the mediator himself, that the methods of conciliation proposed by him are not accepted.

I can not learn that we have proposed any method of concilia-

tion. It is reported that, in a perfunctory way, our Government asked Great Britain if it could do anything to settle the quarrel. Our plain duty was to have acted before the first gun was fired, and then, if refused, to have at once expressed our disapproval of England's course by passing resolutions of sympathy for the South Africa Republics.

UNCLE SAM CODDLES JOHN BULL.

Instead of taking the most American course our Administration has allowed the world to believe we are in full sympathy with Great Britain. Even if there is not a verbal understanding between Mr. Hay, our Secretary of State, and the English Government, approved by the President, it is evident that as long as Mr. McKinley is in power England will have at least the moral support of the United States in whatsoever she may do. I believe that there is such an understanding, for in no other way can I explain the course and conduct of the President.

There is strong corroboration of this view in the visit of the Senator from Ohio, Mr. HANNA, to England last year, and his great admiration for the English Government, expressed on his return.

The struggle going on in South Africa is between the same despotic power, intensified a hundredfold, that over a century ago endeavored to destroy liberty on the American continent and a republic weaker in numbers than we were when we made our triumphant resistance to British tyranny.

Who can say that the Boers are not prompted by as lofty a patriotism, by as ardent a desire for freedom, as inspired our forefathers in that Revolution which, in 1776, brought our own Republic into being as a model after which the liberty of the world has been fashioned.

Under the conditions and circumstances grouped about the origin of our Government and the historical events attending its course of development, the most unnatural alliance for us to make is an English alliance. Our most natural alliance would be one of sympathy with the heroic defenders of the Transvaal, who have been winning victories that take their places beside Marathon, Bunker Hill, and Lexington.

And in response, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, a wave of enthusiasm moves across our continent, and in public meetings the hope everywhere finds expression that the Republic of South Africa shall not perish from the earth, and that the red uplifted hand of British greed may be stayed.

Why, then, did not our Executive take action in behalf of liberty and humanity, action that would have convinced the world that we still believed liberty and humanity should prompt nations in their dealings with each other? Simply because he is engaged in the same wretched business as that which is drenching the soil of Africa with the blood of martyrs. He is busy with an effort to rob the people of the Philippine Islands, and is slaughtering those who resist robbery because, forsooth, it will pay, because they are rich and are worth robbing, and because their island possessions will furnish a foothold for other robberies. The Executive has the power to intercede in behalf of the South African Republic, and if he had spoken as Cleveland spoke in the Venezuela case, there would have been no war in South Africa. But the President will not avail himself of the humane opportunity. The duty is then upon us to act.

OF OUR OWN RACE.

Who are these people that excite our sympathy?

They are of our own race. The same blood courses in their veins and in our veins. They sprang from the Dutch, who drove Phillip out of Holland, and from the French Huguenots, who fled to Holland rather than surrender their convictions. Their career in South Africa is a living, burning page in the history of the world, and the impress of their earnestness comes down to the children of the thirteen colonies through the adoption of the alternative so eloquently voiced by the patriot Virginian, "Give me liberty or give me death."

I hope to enjoy the day when England shall have been driven from every foot of the soil of Africa and a republic of united and happily governed states constructed on the ruins of her despotic power. England has conquered no people but to rob them, has governed no race but to blight it with the curse of her presence. The Boers know her methods and their results better than any people in the world. Sixty-five years ago they left their homes in Cape Colony and fled into the wilderness, preferring to wander in the desert and fight for an existence against the savage tribes of that region than accept the pretended protection of a nation of canting hypocrites.

The South African Republic and the Orange Free State are in the interior of South Africa, and neither of these Republics touches the coast at any point. The South African Republic is separated from the Indian Ocean by a long, narrow strip of coast land, from 30 to 60 miles in width, owned by Portugal. The chief seaport is Lourenco Marquez, on Delagoa Bay. Both of these Republics are dry, treeless, elevated plains, broken by mountain ranges, like Wyoming. They are naturally too dry for successful cultivation, but are covered with the rich grasses of semiarid growth. Farming is carried on through irrigation. Small patches of ground along the low river bottoms produce crops without irrigation, but their area is limited. Timber is scarce and is found only upon land contiguous to the streams. The principal industry is raising cattle, and the population is scattered over wide areas in isolated communities.

The area of the South African Republic (or the Transvaal) is 119,139 square miles.

Its population in 1898 was 336,400 whites—137,900 men and 107,450 women and 101,000 children—with a black population of 748,750 persons. Pretoria, the capital, has a population of 10,000.

Johannesburg, which is the gold-mining center, has a population of 108,063 people—79,500 men and 28,763 women; the whites, 60,000; Chinese, 4,800; black, 42,500. In the Transvaal there are 10,000 Jews. The rest of the population are Protestants, mostly Dutch Reform and Lutheran. The Republic owns the railroads and telegraph lines. The total revenue is over twenty millions; but this includes railroads, telegraph, postal receipts, and the sale of explosives.

THE BOER GOVERNMENT.

The government is a republic.

The legislature consists of two houses of 27 members each.

No person can be a member of either house unless he is 30 years of age and possessed of fixed property. The term of service is four years.

The first chamber is elected by the first-class burghers.

The first-class burghers are white male persons residing in the republic prior to 1876, or those who fought in the wars of the republic, including the Jameson raid, and the children of such persons over 16 years of age.

The second chamber of the legislature is elected by the first and second class burghers.

Second-class burghers are naturalized citizens and their children over 16 years of age.

Naturalization may be obtained after two years' residence by taking the oath of allegiance and paying \$10.

Naturalized burghers may become first-class burghers after twelve years.

Sons of naturalized burghers may become naturalized burghers at 18 years of age.

First-class burghers ten years thereafter.

The president and commanding general are elected by the first-class burghers only.

The executive authority is vested in a president, elected for five years, assisted by a council of four members.

The Orange Free State is south of the Transvaal, and has an area of 48,300 square miles, and in 1890 had a population of 77,700 whites and 130,000 blacks or natives.

The capital is Bloemfontein, with a population of 2,077 whites and 1,300 blacks.

The railroads and telegraph lines are owned by the government.

Exclusive of the railroads the revenues in 1897 was \$2,010,000, and the expenses \$1,905,000.

Government.—Written constitution. President elected for five years by voters. Executive council consists of the secretary and four others.

Legislature.—Popular assembly; 60 members, elected by popular vote for four years, one-half every two years; salary, \$10 per day; qualification, burghers 25 years old, owner of real estate valued at \$2,500. Voters, white burghers, by birth or naturalization, who own real property worth \$750 or pay a rent of \$180 per annum or a yearly income of not less than \$1,000 or own personal property worth \$1,500.

Law.—Roman Dutch. Supreme court, composed of three judges. Circuit courts.

Religion.—Dutch Reform, 68,940; English Episcopal, 1,353; Methodist, 753; Lutheran, 312; Roman Catholic, 416; Jews, 113.

Education, free, compulsory, and universal. Two daily and two weekly papers.

SMALL IN NUMBERS, BUT GREAT IN BATTLE.

Every man over 16 years of age or under 60 is enrolled in the militia and trained to handle arms, but the standing army is very small, consisting of a few trained artillerymen. The total white population of these two Republics is less than 500,000, and they are to-day holding in check and have repeatedly defeated the greatest army England ever sent from her shores. Their army has no doubt received many recruits from Cape Colony.

Cape Colony is a British colony, and embraces the southern coast of Africa, possessing an area of 191,400 square miles, with a population of 956,900 people in 1891. Of these 336,900 are European, three-fourths of the white population Dutch, and those who first occupied Cape Colony were the ancestors of the Boers of the two Republics now at war with Great Britain.

Cape Colony was settled by the Dutch in 1652, when a number of Holland farmers were landed at Table Bay, now Cape Town, for the purpose of raising vegetables and cattle to supply the Dutch vessels engaged in trade with India, Java, and Borneo. This trade was very profitable and the settlement prospered. The vessels of all nations trading with the East put in here to secure fresh supplies, and thus the farmers found a good market for all their crops. Families arrived each year from Holland, and the settlement spread along the coast and into the interior and engaged in all kinds of agriculture and stock raising. They made slaves and servants of members of the native tribes of blacks, compelling them to cease their wandering habit and establish themselves in permanent settlements.

In 1795 England, being at war with Holland, sent a fleet and an army to South Africa and captured Cape Town and garrisoned it. England held the colony until 1803, and then surrendered it to the Batavian Republic; but in 1806, the Batavian Republic having been conquered by Napoleon and erected into the Kingdom of Holland, with Louis Bonaparte upon the throne, England sent a fleet of ships and an army of soldiers and again captured Cape Town and resumed the government of the country.

In 1814, when Holland again became independent and the monarchy was restored, England refused to surrender Cape Colony, but annexed it to the British Empire and paid Holland \$30,000,000 for a quitclaim title to the colony.

BRITISH CONTEMPT FOR THE DUTCH.

England despised the Dutch and her officers treated them with contempt, and under her domineering rule the people were oppressed.

All semblance of a republican form of government was abolished.

Civil offices were filled from England with broken members of Parliament, with bad, if any, character.

Adventurers, worthless sons of distinguished men, were commissioned to rule the colonists, and places were even bartered away for money.

The English language was made the official language, and no man could serve on a jury unless he could speak English. In the country the people were not able to employ the English language. All trials, therefore, had to be conducted in Cape Town; and men charged with offenses were taken long distances from their homes and tried by a jury of foreigners, whose language the victims of so-called justice could not understand.

The vagrant laws were repealed, and the consequence was that the country swarmed with Hottentots, who begged from and robbed the settlers and became worthless, diseased tramps. They were rapidly becoming extinct under this loose system, although while the strict Dutch rules were in vogue these natives had been giving promise of rapid civilization.

The Dutch have demonstrated superior ability in civilizing inferior races and seldom go to war with them, while the English have developed no capacity in that direction. Where the contact is close and constant, English rule has resulted in ceaseless conflict, wearisome war, and the final extinction of the inferior race by the sword and by disease.

Finally England freed the slaves of the colonists under a proposition to pay about half their value to their owners. Payment for the slaves was to be made in London, and so the Dutch farmers

found themselves the victims of claim agents, and, being under the disadvantage of inability to speak the language, many never presented their claims. Those who did were robbed by attorneys, agents, and middlemen, so that they realized only one-quarter of the value of the property.

The Dutch, had they been accorded proper treatment, would have been contented and would have made loyal citizens. They would have united in marriage with English settlers who had begun to locate in the colony, for they were of the same family or race as the English. But England treated them as conquered subjects, as an inferior race, as people fit only to be trampled upon. Thus, after almost a century, she is reaping the fruits of tyranny in a war waged in self-defense by the descendants of those people who should and would have remained loyal under the beneficent management of a humane government.

A DECAYING EMPIRE.

Great Britain is gathering the harvest of a policy that is testing the strength of the Empire and may accomplish its overthrow. One thing is certain: England's prestige is gone and the limit of her aggressive empire has been reached. Decay, rapid decay, will now set in. The reflex influence of a century of wrong practiced upon others has destroyed the manhood and the character of the people at home, and the ranks of her armies are no longer filled with the sturdy farmers of the days of Drake and Howard.

In discussing the events that follow I have drawn my information from British sources alone.

South Africa, by George M. Theal, page 175:

It is not a pleasant admission for an Englishman to make, but it is the truth, that it would be difficult to find in any part of the world a people with so much cause to be discontented as were the old inhabitants of Cape Colony for many years after the fall of the ministry of the Earl of Liverpool.

Page 196, Theal gives the cause of the Dutch leaving Cape Colony:

First. There was subjection by a foreign and unsympathetic government.

Second. There was prohibition of their language in the public offices and the courts of law.

Third. There was the superintendent of the London Missionary Society, their ablest and most relentless opponent, in possession of boundless influence with the British authorities.

Fourth. There were the slanderous statements made by the philanthropic societies of England concerning them.

Fifth. There was the sudden emancipation of their slaves without adequate compensation.

Sixth. There was the whole mass of the colored people placed upon a political footing with them, and that without a vagrant act being put in force.

Seventh. There was no security for life or property in the eastern districts, which were exposed to invasion by the Kosas, as the secretary of state took part with the barbarians.

These were the chief causes of the great emigration, and there were many others of less importance.

Froude, Oceana (page 39), sides with the Boers and gives the same reason for their departure.

Bryce, M. P., in North American Review, December, 1899:

She [England] altered the system of courts and local government, reducing the rights which the people had enjoyed. She insisted on the use of the English language to the exclusion of Dutch. In undertaking to protect the natives and the slaves whom the Dutch were accused by the English missionaries of treating very harshly, that the missionaries sometimes maligned them and greatly resented the attention which was paid to the charges. Finally she abolished slavery and allotted a very inadequate sum as compensation to the South African slaveholders, much of which sum never reached their hands because it was made payable in London.

BOERS FLED FROM BRITISH INJUSTICE.

For these reasons, in 1836 thousands of the Dutch abandoned their homes, took their cattle and personal property, made domiciles of their wagons, and started northward into the wilderness, fighting their way or making their peace with the savage tribes. They crossed the Orange River and then considered themselves beyond English dominion, for over and over again England had declared that she would not enlarge her possessions in South Africa. Here the settlers established a rude republic, and enjoyed the freedom implanted in their natures generations ago. To these descendants of the men who let the sea in upon Holland rather than submit to the hateful rule of the Duke of Alva, liberty was dearer than life.

That portion of Africa to which these people had gone in search of a land where freedom might thrive without restraint was dry and fit only for grazing purposes. It lies in the high plains region at the head of the Orange River. Along the east coast of southern Africa there is thrown a chain of high mountains parallel with the sea.

Some of the migrating settlers crossed the mountains and found their eastern slopes plenteously clothed with rich vegetation. Near the coast semitropical plants grew in luxurious abundance. Rains gave the soil an adequate supply of moisture, and the streams plunged over great precipices down to the sea. At what is now Durban was found a fine harbor. Many of the emigrants followed the transmountain explorers and settled along the east slope, contiguous to the sea. Here, however, the Dutch home-seekers ran counter to England's scheme of benevolence toward mankind (for we of the United States are not the originators of governmental desire to make all people happy), and the sturdy wanderers were forced by British bayonets to recross the mountain chain and occupy the inhospitable plateaus of the semiarid belt. The country about Durban, the colony of Natal, the coast line the Boers had hoped to make lodgment upon, was promptly annexed to the Empire of Great Britain, and England thanked God that the circumference of the sea was safe from the occupancy of any other power.

The Boers, determined not to submit to British rule, went back over the mountains and located upon plains between the Orange River and the Vaal River, some of their number crossing the Vaal and settling in what is known as the Transvaal. England, however, adhered to the dogma that "Once a British subject, always a British subject;" that by migrating to and subduing new land these sturdy farmers, fleeing from English oppression, were extending the domain of the Crown, and so in 1846 England affirmed her title by arbitrarily annexing all the country between the Orange and the Vaal rivers, embracing what is now the Orange Free State. A war ensued. The Boers were defeated at Bloemfontein by an army dispatched from Cape Town to enforce the merciless edict of an implacable sovereign.

WHAT AN ENGLISH HISTORIAN SAYS.

Froude (an Englishman) has truthfully written that England always hates those whom she has injured. But with the aid of the Boers beyond the Vaal the republic maintained the contest, with varying success, until 1852, when England made a treaty with the Boers by which she recognized the Dutch settlement beyond the Vaal as a free and independent state. In 1854, by treaty,

England also recognized the independence of the Orange Free State. The treaty of 1852 was confirmed by the cabinet of Lord Derby, and the treaty of 1854 was confirmed by the cabinet of Lord Aberdeen. Thus both of the English political parties participated in the recognition of these two Republics as independent states.

Following the treaty of 1852, peace reigned for seventeen years.

In 1869 a dispute arose concerning the boundary between the Orange Free State and the native tribes. England interfered and after some fighting decided in favor of the Orange Free State, and a treaty was signed, called the treaty of Aliwal North, fixing the boundary of the Orange Free State so as to embrace all the territory in which the South African (or Kimberley) diamond mines were located.

Froude may tell the story of English duplicity and treachery. I read from pages 45 and 46 of his *Oceana*:

The ink on the treaty of Aliwal North was scarcely dry when diamonds were discovered in large quantities in a district which we had ourselves treated as a part of the Orange territory before our first withdrawal, and which had ever since been administered by Orange Free State magistrates. There was a rush of diggers from all parts of the country. There was a genuine fear that the Boers would be unable to control the flock of vultures which was gathering over so rich a prey. There was a notion also that the finest diamond mine in the world ought not to be lost to the British Empire. It was discovered that the part of the country in which it lay was not a part of the Free State at all and that it belonged to a Griqua chief named Waterboer. The chief, in past times, had been an ally of the English. The Boers were accused of having robbed him. He appealed for help and in an evil hour we lent ourselves to an aggression for which there was no excuse. Lord Kimberly gave his name to the new settlement.

The Dutch were expelled. They did not resist, but they yielded under protest to superior forces, and from that day no Boer in South Africa has been able to trust to English promise. The manner in which we acted or allowed our representatives to act was insolent in its cynicism.

We had gone in as the champions of the oppressed Waterboer. We gave Waterboer and his Griquas a tenth of the territory. We kept the rest, and all that was valuable, for ourselves. What could the Dutch have done worse? We have accused them of breaking their engagement with us, and it was we who taught them the lesson. A treaty but a few months old was staring us in the face. Even if Waterboer's title had been as good as his friends pretended, we had pledged ourselves to meddle no more in such matters, in language as plain as words could make it.

Our conduct would have been less entirely intolerable if we had rested simply on superior strength—if we had told the Boers simply that we must have the diamond fields and intended to take them; but we poisoned the wound and we justified our action by posing before the world as the protectors of the rights of native tribes whom we accuse them of having wronged.

And we maintained this attitude through the controversy which afterwards arose. I had myself inquired subsequently into the details of this transaction, perhaps the most discreditable in the annals of English history.

A SAMPLE OF BRITISH HONOR.

Theal (an English writer), *South Africa*, page 325, finishes the story in the following language:

President Brand, of the Free State, then went to England and laid the case before the imperial authorities. In brief it was this: That Great Britain had taken the land from the Free State under pretense that it belonged to Waterboer, and that a British court after a careful examination had decided that Waterboer had no right to it. The reply which Brand received was to the effect that it was a necessity for the paramount power in South Africa to be in possession of the diamond mines, but he would receive \$450,000 for Griqualand West, which contained the diamond fields, as a solution. This sum President Brand accepted. There was no other way.

English honor went for naught. The Boers had long since found that out, and hatred of England and of Englishmen had become an inherited trait of Boer character.

The country beyond the Vaal was loosely governed. The Boers did not like to pay taxes, so each community would meet occasionally in mass meeting and make their own laws, being better

satisfied with the home product than with the kind sent them from the charnel house of corruption across the seas.

The blacks outnumbered the whites and the disparity in numbers emboldened the natives. Conflicts between roving bands and the settlers were a result of this condition. The situation furnished the excuse, and in 1877 England marched an armed force into the Transvaal and declared that it was annexed to the British Crown as a colony, under the pretext of establishing a stable government for the protection of life and property.

The Boers did not at first resist this usurpation of government and seizure of territory. They were scattered over wide areas, were poor, and it was not easy to mobilize for defense. In order to avert any tendency toward resistance, the robber government promised the Boers a system of local self-government. It happened, as usual, that the English officials failed to keep their promises, and they became arrogant, insolent, and offensive in the collection of taxes. This condition, forced upon the Boers, continued until 1880, when they revolted, made prisoners of the English garrison, occupied the passes leading to Natal and in three engagements defeated their oppressors, killing over three hundred and wounding as many more. The loss of the farmer warriors in these encounters was 17 killed and 28 wounded.

THE BATTLE OF MAJUBA HILL.

Following these bloody events came the famous and historic battle of Majuba Hill. During the darkness of the night of February 26, 1881, a force of 600 British troops occupied a high hill which commanded the Boer position. With the dawn of the succeeding day the Boer commander, General Joubert, discovered the presence of England's fighting force on the crest high above him. It was an advantage that must be overcome, as its retention involved grave consequences to the cause for which General Joubert had armed his followers. The emergency demanded prompt action and the general called for volunteers to storm the height. In response 150 intrepid Dutchmen stepped forward and offered themselves as a forlorn hope to scale the hill and drive the British away. They were placed under command of Nicholas Smit. After several hours of laborious ascent, Smit reached the top of the elevation at noon with about 80 of his followers. In the face of this heroic success the enemy gave way to panic and fled, suffering the loss of 92 killed, 134 wounded, and 59 prisoners. It was the charge of the old 600 reversed. Theirs not to question why; theirs but to run or die. And they went, leaving among the slain the body of their commander, General Colley. The loss to the Boers was 1 killed and 5 wounded in this sanguinary affair. English historians who belong to the ruling oligarchy of Great Britain say that they were defeated at Majuba Hill by an overwhelming force of Boers, but they give no figures.

The paternal home Government now hurried reinforcements to Africa to wipe out the disgrace of Majuba Hill, but up to date the account has not been squared, unless the surrender of Cronje, with his 3,000 men, to Lord Roberts's army of 78,000, after killing and wounding more English than he had men in his command and holding the British army at bay for months, can be considered as squaring the account.

Gen. Sir Evelyn Wood was in command of the new levy of 12,000 men who took the field against the Boers. It appears, however, that he deemed discretion the better part of valor, for on the 5th of March an armistice was concluded between Sir

Wood and the farmer triumvirate, Paul Kruger, M. W. Pretorius, and Peter Joubert, and this was soon followed by peace, with independence restored to the South African Republic.

The terms agreed upon included a provision recognizing England's suzerainty and the right of that Government to regulate the foreign affairs of the Transvaal, so that no treaty could be made with any foreign state (excepting only the Orange Free State) without England's consent.

THE CURSE OF GOLD.

Having thus recovered their internal independence, the Boers began immediately to plan for complete sovereignty, involving an abandonment of English suzerainty over them, and in 1884, as a result of their efforts, a new convention was signed by Lord Derby on the part of England, by which the South African Republic was granted full recognition. The British resident was withdrawn from Pretoria and a council appointed. In 1885 a new element of discord escaped from the Pandora box of Boer destiny. Gold was discovered. The richest and most remarkable mines in the world were exposed to British cupidity. They were apparently inexhaustible, yielding an even average of gold to each and every ton of ore. As a result of this discovery immigration poured into the Transvaal from all parts of the world. England, Russia, France, Germany, the United States, and Canada sent their quotas of fortune seekers, and many of them were mere adventurers. They invaded the Boer domain, not to found homes and transport their families thither, but to wrest wealth from the soil and send their gains to distant climes.

The Boers soon realized that the newcomers, gathered from every quarter of the globe, would some day outnumber them, and, by the force of numbers, take control of their government and turn their country over to some foreign power. And thus their freedom, so long sought amid dangers and suffering, and for which they had sacrificed so much, would be taken away forever. There were two preventive courses, either of which they had a perfect right to adopt. One was to forbid the opening of more mines, and the other was to limit the franchise and extend the time of residence required before an alien could secure citizenship. The latter course was pursued, and the length of residence required to entitle an immigrant to citizenship was extended to fourteen years.

JAMESON LEARNED SOMETHING ABOUT THE BOERS AS WARRIORS.

England was determined, in pursuance of her historic habit, to possess herself of the Transvaal gold fields. Cecil Rhodes, the president of the South African Chartered Company, and at that time prime minister of Cape Colony, who had made many millions out of diamond mines at Kimberley, devised a plan for the consummation of England's scheme of greed. His plan involved a rebellion on the part of the English residents of Johannesburg and the overthrow of the Dutch government. In pursuance of this plan arms were secreted in the city. Dr. Jameson, administrator of the territories of the South African Company, who had at his disposal a body of mounted police, was brought into the conspiracy and a day fixed for an uprising. On that day Dr. Jameson was to march in with his raiders and assist in accomplishing the overthrow of the Dutch Republic. For some reason the Uitlanders changed the date of the demonstration; but Dr. Jameson, impatient over the delay and believing that his allies in

Johannesburg would fly to arms on the appearance of his force, determined to spring the plot. So, late in December, 1895, with a force of about 800 men, he entered the Transvaal and advanced toward Johannesburg.

The Boers had been warned, and Jameson was soon surrounded and compelled to surrender.

Jameson's force consisted of 512 well-mounted men and a strong quota of artillery, including 8 Maxim guns. The Boers had not over 700 men, and only 50 were at any time actually engaged. The last charge of the English was met and overcome by 7 Boers. Jameson lost 50 men and the Boers 4. On every previous occasion and on each subsequent occasion the British have failed utterly to prevail over the untrained citizen-soldiers of the Dutch Republic.

It is believed, and I believe, that the British foreign office had full knowledge of the contemplated raid and approved it. The affair exhibited all the marks of identification of the time-honored English method as described by Morley, a method that provokes resistance and then assumes that the Queen's forces have been attacked. But in this case the overthrow of Dr. Jameson was so sudden and so complete, and his operation so barefaced, infamous, and unjust, that even the English Government did not dare defend the raid or follow it up, although no one was punished for participating in it.

DETERMINED TO RESIST BRITISH AGGRESSION.

Jameson's revolutionary act caused great indignation among the Dutch of all South Africa and unified them in a determination to resist English aggression. It convinced the most conservative among the inhabitants that there was no limit to English perfidy and English dishonor. The Boers began at once to arm themselves and to fortify and to organize and drill all men between 16 and 60 years of age. Pretoria was fortified and works were constructed to command Johannesburg. Guns and ammunition were bought in Europe, and the miners were taxed to pay for these weapons of war. A treaty was made with the Orange Free State, offensive and defensive.

Members of the English Parliament have said recently that Kruger began his armament before the Jameson raid, with a view to driving the English out of South Africa entirely.

Mr. Drage, M. P., at Derby, December 7, 1899, said:

I charge conspiracy among the Dutch to overthrow English rule in South Africa. The armaments which have been accumulated for many years past, even before the Jameson raid, and the efficient drill and equipment of the Boers, alone showed what their ambitions have been.

The Boers have for nearly eighteen years been accumulating artillery, rifles, melinite, German and Hollander officers with which to oust England from South Africa.

This statement is untrue, but it illustrates the English method of falsehood to justify crime.

In 1895, just before the Jameson raid, Cecil Rhodes sent Major White to Pretoria to see what arms Kruger had, in order to judge what force to send to make the raid successful.

White's diary was afterwards found with a memorandum of the guns he found at Pretoria.

1. One-half dozen very old pieces of ordnance.
 2. One bronze gun of the date of the Second Empire.
 3. A broken Maxim Nordenfeli.
 4. A small muzzle-loader in bad condition.
- Three Maxims and six other guns.

He says:

None of the guns I saw were fit for much work.

Captain Young visited Pretoria for the Times early in 1896, just after the Jameson raid, and he reports:

Orders for batteries of field guns, quick-firing guns, and Maxims, and for sufficient rifles to arm every Dutchman in South Africa were being sent to Europe; European drill inspectors were being imported and forts were being constructed around Pretoria on the most improved designs. One attempt had been made to take their country from them; they were thoroughly convinced that the attempt would be renewed at some future date, so the Boers were determined to be thoroughly on their guard the second time.

For 1892 the military expenditures of the Transvaal were \$150,000, and for 1893 they were less than \$100,000. In 1894 they were less than \$150,000. In 1895, the year of the raid—and there were rumors of the raid for weeks before it occurred—the military expenditures were \$435,000, and in 1896 the expenditures were \$2,500,000.

The St. James Gazette of the 29th of August, 1899, says that in September, 1895, President Kruger asked why the Chartered Company was buying hundreds of horses for presentation to the new Volunteer Rhodesian Horse.

THE BOERS ARMED FOR DEFENSE.

The truth is that the Boers armed only for defense, and after the Jameson raid, and they have continued to arm ever since. They had good reason to prepare for protection, for they saw Chamberlain was still foreign secretary and had whitewashed Cecil Rhodes in Parliament, and England treated Jameson and his raiders as the heroes of the Empire.

Proof is abundant that English spies have been engaged in mapping all the roads, rivers, and defenses in both the Transvaal and the Orange Free State for the past two years. In 1899 England determined to make another effort to secure the gold mines, for their richness had been further demonstrated by the production of over \$80,000,000 in one year.

To accomplish this covetous design excuses must be produced for a quarrel. The English papers began to publish daily editorials rehearsing alleged wrongs perpetrated upon her subjects in the Transvaal. It was said they were taxed without representation, and a demand was made that the time required by the Dutch law to acquire the right to vote for members of both houses should be reduced to five years.

These assertions were formulated by Chamberlain, the minister for the colonies, and presented by the British representative at Pretoria, and then the British Government, for the first time in its history, presented the curious spectacle of one government endeavoring to compel another government to make it easy for her English citizens to renounce their allegiance to the Queen.

After negotiations had continued for several months, the government of the Transvaal surrendered to all the demands of the English, and sent the following communication to Mr. Chamberlain, through the English representative at Pretoria, who said there was no doubt it would be accepted:

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS, GOVERNMENT OFFICE,
Pretoria, August 19, 1899.

SIR: With reference to your request for a joint inquiry, contained in your dispatches of August 2 and 3, the Government of the South African Republic have the honor to suggest the alternative proposal for the consideration of Her Majesty's Government, which this Government trusts may lead to final settlement.

1. The Government are willing to recommend to the Volksraad and the people a five years' retrospective franchise, as proposed by his excellency the high commissioner at Bloemfontein on June 1, 1899.

2. The Government are further willing to recommend to the Volksraad

that 8 new seats in the First Volksraad and, if necessary, also in the Second Volksraad be given to the population of the Witwatersrand, thus, with the 2 sitting members of the gold fields, giving to the population thereof 10 representatives in a Raad of 36, and in the future the representation of the gold fields of this Republic shall not fall below the proportion of one-fourth of the total.

3. The new burghers shall, equally with the old burghers, be entitled to vote at the election for State President and commandant-general.

4. The Government will always be prepared to take into consideration such friendly suggestions regarding the details of the franchise law as Her Majesty's Government, through the British agent, may wish to convey to it.

5. In putting forward the above proposals the Government of the South African Republic assumes:

(a) That Her British Majesty's Government will agree that the present intervention shall not form a precedent for future similar action, and that in the future no interference in the internal affairs of the Republic will take place.

(b) That Her Majesty's Government will not further insist on the assertion of the suzerainty, the controversy on this subject being allowed tacitly to drop.

(c) That arbitration (from which foreign element other than Orange Free State is to be excluded) will be conceded as soon as the franchise scheme has become law.

The Government trusts that Her Majesty's Government will clearly understand that in the opinion of this Government the existing franchise law of this Republic is both fair and liberal to the new population, and that the consideration which induces them to go further, as they do in the above proposals, is their strong desire to get the controversies between the two Governments settled; and, further, to put an end to the present strained relations between the two Governments and the incalculable harm and loss it has already occasioned in South Africa, and to prevent a racial war, from the effects of which South Africa may not recover for many generations, perhaps never at all.

ENGLAND INCREASED UNREASONABLE DEMANDS.

Mr. Chamberlain rejected the reasonable proposals, and, instead of coming to a fair understanding, he increased his demands. The Boers were disheartened and grieved. Consequently the South African Republic withdrew its proposals and asked Her Majesty's Government to stand by the original ones.

Mr. Chamberlain replied by breaking off negotiations in the form of an ultimatum, saying:

The Imperial Government are now compelled to consider the situation afresh and formulate proposals for a final settlement of the issues which have been created in South Africa by the policy constantly followed for many years by the Government of the South African Republic (the Transvaal).

They will communicate the result of their deliberation in a later dispatch.

It was then September 22. The promised proposals were not forthcoming. The efforts of Mr. Green, the consular agent in Pretoria, were in vain. In the meantime and previous to these negotiations war preparations were going on, and a cry for war was heard in the English Parliament. To gain time was the scheme for the present until the British Government had a sufficient army landed, so as to dictate terms. The Boers waited until October, and then sent an ultimatum demanding that no more troops be sent to Africa pending negotiations and offering to arbitrate.

Mr. Chamberlain now replied that the Dutch were not an independent nation and that they were in revolt against their sovereign, the Queen of England. This was a position Mr. Chamberlain could not sustain, for after the Jameson raid, when he was criticised in Parliament, on May 20, 1896, he made the following statement:

In some quarters the idea is put forward that the Government ought to have issued an ultimatum, which would have certainly been rejected and which must have led to war. Sir, I do not propose to discuss such a contingency as that. A war in South Africa would be one of the most serious wars that could possibly be waged. It would be in the nature of a civil war. It would be a long

war, a bitter war, and a costly war. It would leave behind it the embers of a strife, which I believe generations would hardly be long enough to extinguish. To go to war with President Kruger in order to force upon him reforms in the internal affairs of his State, in which secretaries of state, standing in this place, have repudiated all right of interference—that would be a course of action as immoral as it would have been unwise.

SIMILAR TO THE PRESIDENT'S TALK.

That declaration bears great similarity to the talk of our President when he announced that forcible annexation would be criminal aggression.

It is very appropriate that, as we should be trying to destroy a republic in partnership with England, the President's own words and Chamberlain's own words are sufficient to expose the duplicity of both.

In February, 1896, in a speech, Mr. Chamberlain made the following statement:

The answer which has hitherto been given, not on the part of the Transvaal, but on the part of some of its friends, was that to grant this request was to commit suicide, inasmuch as the moment the majority got the franchise the first use they would make of it would be to turn out the existing Government of the Transvaal and substitute a government of their own liking. [Hear! Hear! and laughter.] I confess I thought there was some reason in that objection. It is difficult to attempt to persuade anyone so capable as President Kruger that it would be desirable that he should proceed to his own extinction, and accordingly I brought before him an alternative suggestion, which, at all events, would relieve him from that difficulty. The question is whether President Kruger will consider that that proposal will endanger the security of the Transvaal Government. If he does, he will be perfectly justified in rejecting it.

James Bryce, M. P., in the *North American Review*, December, 1899, says:

Under the convention of 1884, which fixed the relations of Britain and the South African Republic, the latter had the most complete control of its internal affairs, and Britain possessed no more general right of interfering with those affairs than with the affairs of Belgium or Portugal. The suzerainty which has been claimed for her, if it existed (for its existence under the convention of 1884 is disputed), related solely to the power of making treaties and did not touch any domestic matter.

That which caused the war was the discussion of another matter altogether, which was admittedly not a grievance for the redress of which Britain had any right to interfere, and which therefore could not possibly amount to a *casus belli*. This matter was the length of time which should elapse before the new immigrants into the Transvaal could be admitted to citizenship, a matter entirely within the control of the Transvaal legislature.

A PRICE THAT WOULD STAGGER HUMANITY.

It is the story of the diamond mines over again, with this exception: The Transvaal after the Jameson raid began to buy arms, and has become an arsenal of modern war equipment. Paul Kruger announced to the nations of the earth that, if they must surrender their liberties, England would pay a price in human life that would stagger humanity.

But was there oppression in the Dutch Republic, of the Uitlanders or miners, as they are called?

Thael says, on page 350 in his work on South Africa:

The great majority of the people engaged in the mining industry are English speaking, while the farming population is Dutch. The intercourse between them is, upon the whole, friendly, and each section certainly exercises considerable influence upon the other. In the legislature, however, the English-speaking section is almost powerless, and taxation is arranged so as to fall lightly upon agriculture. In other respects no one has anything to complain of.

Andrew Carnegie, in the *North American Review* for December, 1899, says:

In the Transvaal there was scarcely any people but the Dutch until the discovery of the mines, which have attracted foreigners from all nations,

until to-day, by counting all foreigners as British, there may be a small majority against the Dutch; but these are not all British. Some estimate that there are not more than 6,000 British among the miners. Those of all other nationalities do not side with the British as against the Dutch. The vast majority of these, as well as of the British, are opposed to the present attack upon the Transvaal. Of this there can be no doubt. The people are working the mines, receiving enormous wages and only wish to be let alone. They do not wish to become burghers in order to vote; especially is this true of the British. I have peculiar means of knowing this. Several of the tenants upon my Skibo estates have sons or brothers in the mines, and I have from time to time been informed of the letters which they write home. There is one now in charge of an important mine whose letters are most significant. He stated to his father in one of these what I have already said, and that the Britons liked the Boers and did not wish to become burghers. They were there as Britons to make money and finally to return to their homes. They wanted no franchise. He stated that the petition to Her Majesty praying her to interfere was not generally signed by the Britons, and that many of the foreigners signed the petition believing it had reference to some dreaded temperance legislation in which they were deeply concerned.

AMERICANS SYMPATHIZE WITH BOERS.

H. A. Rose, formerly superintendent of the Homestake mine, in South Dakota, now engaged in mining in the Transvaal, writes a friend at Deadwood that the sympathies of most American miners there are with the Boers, and that many of them will fight in the ranks of the Dutch army. The miners are of the opinion that if the British conquer and get possession of the gold mines, which are the richest in the world, the miners' wages will at once be reduced.

William Adan, who left Sioux Falls, which is my home, some years ago for South Africa, writes that he left Johannesburg just three days before hostilities between England and the Boers commenced. He says that the war was uncalled for and that the so-called injustice of the Boer laws was greatly exaggerated by the British press. The Boers, he says, are a very temperate class of people, and the foreigner who behaved himself and acted like a man was respected by them and had no more trouble than in any other civilized community in the world.

Froude thus describes the Boers in his book *Oceana*, on page 42:

The Boer, as we call him, is a slow, good-humored person, not given to politics, occupied much with his religion and his private affairs.

The Boers of South Africa, of all human beings now on this planet, correspond nearest to Horace's description of the Roman peasant soldiers who defeated Pyrrhus and Hannibal. There alone you will find obedience to parents as strict as among the ancient Sabines, the severa mater whose sons fetch and carry at her bidding, who, when those sons go to fight for their country, will hand their rifles to them and bid them return with their arms in their hands or else not return at all.

They arrange their disputes with the natives with little fighting.

In the Transvaal a million natives live peaceably in the midst of them, working with them and for them. There has been no uprising of the blacks against whites in the Transvaal.

I have presented this evidence to show who the Boers are. Now, who are the Uitlanders? They all, or nearly all, live in Johannesburg, which is a city of 108,000 people, 28,000 women and 80,000 men. The whites number 60,000 and the blacks 43,000. There are 5,000 Chinese. Very few white women live in Johannesburg, and nearly all who are there are harlots. Chamberlain and the English Government pretend to the world that Great Britain was forced to go to war against the Boers to redress the wrongs of these unmarried men who are living there without family ties or social restraints, intending to remain only long enough to make their fortunes and then depart. These foreigners were not asking for the franchise, and now this young Republic is to be destroyed

by England's mighty army because Paul Kruger would not turn his government over to this band of adventurers, to these men without families and the consorts of harlots.

NOT WRONGS AGAINST UITLANDERS.

Mr. President, it was not the alleged wrongs of the Uitlanders that caused the war. We must look for another reason. Any person familiar with English history for the past century will experience no trouble in reaching the cause.

I find the following in Reynolds's Newspaper, London:

1. The taxes in the Transvaal are levied on the rich and not on the poor. The Uitlander worker who earns from £5 to £10 a week is only taxed to the extent of 18s. per annum.

2. Wages at the Kimberley mines, under Rhodes & Co. and the British Government, are less by one-half than those of the Transvaal mines.

The Johannesburg capitalists have declared in print that so soon as Britain has annexed the Transvaal wages will be lowered by 40 per cent.

3. In the Transvaal Sunday labor is prohibited, and the authorities fine any employer who permits it.

In Kimberley, under the British flag, the mines are kept going seven days a week.

4. In the Transvaal the working day for both black and white men is eight hours by law.

At Kimberley black men are worked for twelve hours a day.

5. In Kimberley what is called the "compound" system is in force for colored men. This is slavery by another name. The Government of the Transvaal Republic will not allow the system to be introduced into the Transvaal.

6. At the meeting of the South African Chartered Company the other day, Earl Grey said that our—the British—Government would support the company in the introduction of native (black) and Asiatic (yellow) "labor" because of its "cheapness" as compared with white or British "labor."

The real motive for the war against the Boërs is founded in English greed, in English cupidity, and in English dishonor.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S FABRICATIONS.

Labouchere, M. P., in his paper, the London Truth, of January 18, 1899, says:

The real fact, as every day is becoming more clear, is that Mr. Rhodes wished to reacquire power in the Cape in order to sell his chartered company to us with the aid and approval of the Cape Colony, and that the mine owners in the Transvaal wanted to convert its government into an organization to crimp blacks and to force them to work in the mines. Admitting that we had cause to complain of the treatment by the Transvaal of our citizens in not allowing them to make a sufficient number of blacks work for them, we ought to have consented to arbitration, as suggested by President Kruger. The only reason we did not was that any independent investigation would have blown to the winds the fabrications of the South African League and of the Transvaal mine owners which were circulated by Mr. Chamberlain in order to arouse the passions of Englishmen at home to war point.

Mr. Frederic Harrison, one of the foremost men of England, has to say about this question of the franchise in the Transvaal. In an open letter to Lord Salisbury, the premier of Great Britain, published in the London Chronicle August, 1899, Mr. Harrison said:

"Measured by the compromises with foreign nations which you may justly claim to have brought to a successful issue, the concessions already accepted by the Republic are indeed decisive. From nine years to seven years, from seven to five years, from one demand of the outlanders to another, the Boers have given way. They have already conceded the whole of the original demand made upon them and have even added more. And at every fresh concession Sir Alfred Milner is instructed to make further demands, until throughout the Transvaal, and we may well add at home, the impression prevails that it is not concession of claims which is sought from the Republic, but submission, humiliation, and loss of independence. Is this how negotiations have been carried on, when you, my lord, as head of the foreign office have dealt with Russia, Turkey, France, or the United States? This is not negotiation. It is war, war of naked aggression, war wherein the Boers will not yield without a desperate struggle and after bloody combats, a war

which can not be closed by a few victories nor the traces of it wiped out by a few promises or proclamations, a war wherein many true and patriotic Englishmen devoutly trust that the Boers may not be ultimately crushed."

ANOTHER TRUTHFUL ENGLISHMAN.

Mr. J. A. Hobson, in the London Speaker, asked "What are we fighting for?" And he then asserted that the mine owners in the Transvaal desired to overthrow the Republic so they could enact the same slave-labor laws in force at Kimberley; so that they could repeal the eight-hour law and compel the black laborers, at least, to work twelve hours a day; so that they could repeal the Sunday laws and run the mines seven days each week, as they do at Kimberley. Mr. Hobson says:

The attitude of the mining industry toward the Transvaal Government in respect of the labor question is instructive. Witnesses before the industrial commission at Johannesburg were unanimous in maintaining that it was the duty of the Government to procure a steady and sufficient supply of Kaffirs for the mines. The Government was called upon to accredit and assist agents of the mining industry to obtain native labor, to pay premiums to Kaffir chiefs, to furnish extra pay to the native commissioners for the same object, and to convey this labor "under supervision" to the mines, erecting "compounds" along the road, reducing railroad fares to one-third of the existing rate, and in a dozen other ways spending further money in serving the private interests of the mines. Why politics and economics are so closely connected that the public purse should be used to keep down the wages bill of the mines is not intelligible to English people. But it is perfectly clear that under a "reformed" government the mine owners will take every care to press these claims.

The testimony of Mr. Albu before the industrial commission at Johannesburg throws a great deal of light upon this feature of the case:

"The native at the present time receives a wage which is far in excess of the exigencies of his existence. The native earns between 50 shillings and 60 shillings per month, and then he pays nothing for food or lodging. In fact, he can save nearly all that he receives. If the native can save £20 a year, it is almost sufficient for him to go home and live on the fat of his land. In five or six years' time the native population will have saved enough money to make it unnecessary for them to work any more. The consequences of this will be most disastrous for the industry and the State. This question applies to any class of labor and in any country, whether it be in Africa, Europe, or America. I think if the native gets enough to save £5 a year, the sum is quite enough for his requirements and will prevent natives from becoming rich in a short space of time.

"You say the native does not require luxuries, and if he has worked for a year he has saved enough to go back to his kraal and remain idle?"

"Yes.

"Can you suggest any remedy for this?"

"The only remedy which I can suggest is that we pay the native a wage which, while enabling him to save money, will hinder him from becoming exceptionally rich.

"Is it in the control of the mining industry to regulate the wages of Kaffirs?"

"To a great extent—that is, if the Government assists us in bringing labor to this market."

A CONSPIRACY AGAINST LABOR.

Here, Mr. President, is the gist of the whole controversy. If the English Government conquer the Transvaal, they will take those people, as they did at Kimberley, to assist in bringing labor to the market. In fact, to-day there are four English colonies where the contract-labor system is in force—Jamaica, British Guiana, Mauritius, and Trinidad. There a system of slave labor exists enforced by the British Government, the laborers being imported under contract and driven to toil by their slave masters, punished if they are idle, fined, and compelled to have the hours which they shall toil regulated by the labor contractor; and an English writer announces to-day that this is the proper system for labor in the Tropics; that no matter what country holds colonies in the Tropics, the labor system adopted by the English at

Kimberley, in British Guiana, in Jamaica, and in Trinidad is the system for the best interests of the laborer and of the employer.

Mr. Hobson says:

If this war can be successfully accomplished and a settlement satisfactory to the mine owners can be reached, the first fruits of victory will be represented in a large, cheap, submissive supply of black and white labor, attended by such other economies of cost as will add millions per annum to the profits of the mines.

The blood and the money of the people of Great Britain are being spent for this purpose. No other definite, tangible result of the conflict can be shown. The men who, owning the South African press and its political organizations, engineered the agitation which has issued in this war are the same men whose pockets will swell with this increase. Open-eyed and persistent, they have pursued their course, plunging South Africa into a temporary ruin in order that they may emerge victorious, a small confederacy of international mine owners and speculators, holding the treasures of South Africa in the hollow of their hands.

Any person who will examine this disgraceful chapter of English history will find that the more closely it is looked into, the more shocking it becomes, and he will be led to marvel that the world looks on while the infamy is being accomplished.

THE BLESSINGS OF ENGLISH RULE.

The argument employed to silence the consciences of the small number of English people who are possessed of that moral faculty is that they propose to confer the blessings of English rule upon these people.

Is English rule such a blessing?

In India to-day 75,000,000 of enforced British subjects are starving, and Moreton Frewen, a prominent English writer, with an estate in Ireland, says the chief cause of this condition was the closing of the India mints to silver coinage, thus destroying the value of the savings of these people, which were in silver ornaments and bullion. We may add to this cause the vast sums taken annually from India by taxation to support a foreign army and a great foreign pension list.

Before English occupation a native farmer could not be deprived of his title to his land. No matter how deeply he might become involved in debt, the title to his home was sacred and could not be taken away. England changed the law and allowed the title to pass by foreclosure or by judgment for debt, and the result has been the same as it has been in every other place where similar practices exist—the usurers are acquiring vast estates, the independent land owners are becoming tenants and hence slaves, forced to take what is left of the product of their toil after their landlords are satisfied. These causes, all the result of English rule, have produced starvation in India every year, and in bad years, like the present, people die by millions. What is given in compensation for this horrid condition? The people of India have not adopted anything that is English. They are not Christians. They can not speak the language of their conquerors. In fact, England has never tried to Christianize them or teach them the English language. England's only incentive to the improvement of the Indian has been, how much money can our favored classes make out of India by exploiting the country for franchises and by taxation?

Mr. MASON. I would not interrupt the Senator but for the

fact that he is just leaving the question as to the cause of the famine in India; and I wish to ask him, is it not also true that one of the principal causes of that famine is that the cereals of India which the natives raise are exported and taken away to England—that the very food they themselves raise is taken away from them?

MILLIONS STARVING IN INDIA.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Oh, yes, Mr. President. I say that, added to the fact that silver has been demonetized in India, comes the shipping away of vast sums to feed the British army and an enormous civil pension list. The food supply of India to the amount of \$150,000,000 a year is shipped away and sold for the purpose of paying a vast army of pensioners in England who have been engaged in the Indian service—either the civil or the military service. The balance of trade is in favor of India \$150,000,000 each year, but no money goes to India to square the account. It is squared by the pretended philanthropic services of the English civil service and the English army, who are there simply to advance the interests of English capital.

Mr. MASON. There are more people starving in India than the English are losing in the South African war.

Mr. PETTIGREW. There are fifty-odd million people in India to-day who are starving. In fact, 80 out of every 100 of the people of India never have enough to eat. Some few of the people have plenty of food, and 4 out of each hundred live in luxury. That is the effect of caste in India, and we are approaching the same condition of things in this country. It has been accomplished in India by ages of progression, but is being accomplished in this country by a few years of a different system.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is plenty to eat in this country.

Mr. PETTIGREW. The Senator from New Hampshire says he has plenty to eat.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. PETTIGREW. I am very glad of that, but I presume there are people in New Hampshire who do not, as a rule, have plenty to eat, and there are some in all our great cities.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, I did not say what he represents me as saying. I said our people were getting plenty to eat.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Well, I suppose the Senator is one of the people.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the Senator's statement is hardly borne out by the facts, and I trust the Senator, at least, is not in that category.

SCANT WAGE FOR THE COAL MINER.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, the coal miner in Ohio in 1898 received \$192 for his yearly wage; and, with a family of five, that would leave \$39 per capita to furnish a home, education, food, and raiment for an American citizen and his family. Last year the coal miner in Ohio received \$241 for his yearly wage; which was about \$48 per capita to feed, to clothe, to educate, and to house his family. Whether they had enough to eat or not I have not investigated. I presume they would have been glad to have had more and better food than they could buy with such a wage. Further than that, the wages of the Ohio coal miner were less last year and the year before than were the wages of miners in Austria.

I have previously described Johannesburg, in the Transvaal. It is a typical English foreign settlement.

There are two other English colonies to which I will call your attention—Singapore and Hongkong. The latter is a city of 222,000 people (1891 census). The white population is 8,550, of whom 6,468 are males and 2,082 are females. The Asiatics number 151,100 males and 61,800 females. There are therefore 3 white males to 1 female, and almost three colored males to each female. Even the Asiatics recognize the character of the settlement.

In Singapore there are 184,500 people, 4,312 of whom are white males and 942 white females. There are 135,000 Asiatic males and 40,500 Asiatic females. The white males outnumber the white females more than 4 to 1, and the Asiatic males outnumber the Asiatic females more than $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 1. In both of the typical English colonies even the Asiatics will not live with their families because of the vile character of the settlements. These colonies are little better than brothels, and these Englishmen are there only for purposes of trade. Their golden rule is to keep all they get and get all they can, as the first and the last and the whole duty of man, and the thought of benefiting the people over whom they rule never enters into their calculations.

BRITAIN'S BENEVOLENT ASSIMILATION.

The person would be simple indeed who believed these soulless adventurers were there to teach or practice the golden rule. Yet Kipling says they are there to "bear the white man's burden." At Singapore benevolent assimilation has done its work and has left impress upon the morals of the people.

The Statesman's Year-Book says that in Singapore there are 3,600 Eurasians. I looked to see what a Eurasian was and I found it was a person born of a European father and an Asiatic mother, and through further investigation I learned that not one in twenty was born in lawful wedlock.

The English army and the English police protect property and trade in these colonies, and that is the only boast England can lay claim to wherever her infamous heel has poisoned the earth.

England must rise or fall in her boast of power to govern others and confer the benefits of a Christian civilization upon them by the success or failure of her effort in India; by the success or failure of her effort in Singapore; by the success or failure of her effort in Hongkong, in Jamaica, in Trinidad, in fact, wherever she has planted her flag; and I defy any person to find a colony under English rule, not composed of Englishmen, where they have not been miserably cursed by her presence.

Nothing that is good, nothing that is beneficial, nothing that is of advantage to those people has been conferred by England's presence, until to-day she is hated wherever she is, and it would be a blessing to mankind if she were driven from those countries.

A FEW NOBLE ENGLISHMEN.

Mr. President, there are many noble Englishmen—Mathew Arnold, John Stuart Mill, John Morley, James Bryce are examples which would honor any land or any race; but these men have no influence and exercise no force in shaping the political and industrial elements that control the English Government. The governing classes of England are governed by but one motive—greed—and to satisfy greed they engage in plunder. They have

no higher aim than that which rules the highwayman. They hate and despise all other nations and all other races of men. If they bestow the flattery of friendship upon any nation or any man, it is to enable them to use the intended victim of their mercenary attentions. They scheme to reap an advantage by a pretense of friendship. That is the pretense they are trying to play upon the people of the United States to-day, and I am sorry that they have found a foothold with a so-called American Administration.

Through all time, with what brutal contempt they have looked down upon and despised the Irish people. Just now they find it to their advantage to extol Irish bravery. You may travel around the world and make it a point to associate with the English residents and travelers in every country, and you will find that, which I have found, to be the fact.

In this connection I quote from a letter written by a graduate of Harvard College, who has been in almost every country upon the globe. He says:

I was brought up in an atmosphere of great admiration for England—

If he was brought up in Massachusetts, that is pretty hard on Massachusetts—

and I was an ardent admirer of Great Britain, but after I have traveled in almost every country of Europe and Asia, and met the Briton home and abroad, I came to know that in Germany the British spent their time cursing the Germans. In France they cursed the French. In their own colonies they curse the natives. In Japan they loathe and despise the Japanese. In China no words are too strong to express the British contempt for the average Chinaman. In India they kick and cuff and swear at the natives of India. By mere contact with the British race I have got so I can scarcely speak of them without intense prejudice. I believe that the average Briton, unless you entirely sympathize with him in his prejudices, is the most prejudiced and meanest man in the world. He will have nothing to do with you unless you swing in line with his prejudices.

He must be exceedingly gratified with the present condition of this country, for the Englishman writes our treaties; and when we amend them, they are submitted to him to ascertain whether or not he is willing to accept the amendment previous to our action. I will quote further from this letter of my friend:

As for the boasted freedom of the English courts, from actual experience I think it is all humbug. The British courts are settled in injustice. I had rather be tried by a German or even a Russian court than by an English court. I saw a woman tried in an English court in one of the countries of Asia, and it was utterly shocking to me to see what that woman had to endure. She was charged with having given poison to her husband. I believe her to be innocent to-day, yet the whole community had not a single Englishman who did not vent his British prejudice against this poor woman.

She was sentenced to death, but the sentence was commuted to life imprisonment, and there it will end. I don't believe that the British Government, in its most generous mood, ever mitigated a sentence beyond life imprisonment when it concerned a woman. I should judge that there was solid satisfaction in the whole of England whenever a woman was condemned by the court. Of course the ultimate quality of an Englishman is hypocrisy. Wherever he goes he criticises from his peculiarly hypocritical point of view. If he goes to a French colony, he has unlimited sympathy for the natives who are crushed by the French Government. But if he goes to an English colony, he loathes and despises the natives. I have read in a number of books where Englishmen have traveled in the colonies of foreign nations. Never once have I seen the slightest evidence of fair judgment toward the governing power. It is only the English who understand liberty, and yet they are the most utterly illiberal people toward others in their mode of government on the face of the earth. God help those who are under British rule!

MERELY PROPERTY GRABBERS.

The English Government is organized to promote the getting of property, no matter who produced the property, and to the protection of that property after it has passed into English hands.

This force moves England's navies and sends her armies into distant lands to murder and to rob the weaker nation of its share of the earth.

The rights of man have no place in England's moral or legal lexicon. This is true to such an extent that even in England her courts punish for offenses against property ten times more severely than for offenses against the person. For years London Truth has published in parallel columns the punishments administered for petty thefts and trespass and for brutal assaults, in order to try and correct this abuse, but to no purpose, for English thought has been directed so long to the idea that property is sacred above all things and that the things man produces are more important than the man, that only a revolution in English sentiment can work the needed change; and that revolution can and will come only when the English Empire is dismembered and destroyed, and from its embers shall arise the new Englishman, believing in the rights of his fellow-men in place of the long-existing belief that no people have rights an Englishman is bound to respect.

During the reign of Victoria England has evicted from their homes in Ireland 3,668,000 Irishmen, and 4,185,000 Irishmen have left Ireland and gone to seek homes elsewhere, while during this reign over 1,200,000 people have died of starvation in Ireland. Yet in the midst of the most acute famine experiences vast quantities of food produced in Ireland were shipped to England to appease the appetites of English landlords, while the men, women, and children whose labor produced the food in Ireland died of starvation for the want of what their toil had earned, and the same thing is seen every year in India and is intensified to-day. Irish evictions were always made in the Queen's name. Gladstone said in Parliament: "We are particeps criminis. We with power in our hands look on." Taxation in Ireland to-day is very much higher than it is in England. Moreton Frewen, who is an English landlord with an estate in Ireland, is my authority for this statement.

A CHANCE FOR IRELAND TO STEP IN.

Mr. President, I hope the day will come, and I hope the Transvaal war will furnish the opportunity, when Ireland will rise in her might and drive every English soldier into the sea and every English landlord from her soil. That island belongs to the people who till it. Confiscation of the rights of the nonresident landlord would be eminently justifiable in their case.

But how fares it with India? In the reign of the present monarch over 12,000,000 people have perished from starvation, and this year, the worst of all, that number is likely to be exceeded, as efforts for relief are almost suspended while the English nation spends its money and sheds the blood of its people in an effort to steal the Transvaal gold mines, so that her overrich may reap greater profit and employ slave labor to work the mines. But the opium trade flourishes and is profitable, for that is a government monopoly in India, and over the factories the English flag floats, and upon every package of the deadly drug is the stamp of Victoria and her coat of arms.

During the reign of Victoria, England has been engaged in forty wars, and in every one she was the aggressor. These have been wars of conquest and of plunder. During all this bloody and terrible reign the sun has arisen each morning to be greeted in its course around the world by the shrieks of her victims and the

sound of English guns employed to murder those who resisted her oppression and gave up their lives in the vain effort to stay the course of English greed.

POVERTY STRICKEN AND PAUPERIZED BY BRITISH POLICY.

But the reflex influences of this half century of wrong to others have worked the ruin of the English race at home. One-tenth of her people are paupers; 66 per cent are without property and do not own the shelter over their heads or one foot of the earth on which they live.

Her yeomanry of the last century have disappeared forever. The lands they tilled are in pastures and in parks.

For the first time in history the English troops were beaten in and turned back by the people of central Asia, in 1897.

Soldiers are not bred in the slums of cities; they are not recruited from the families of paupers; and if it were not for the contingent furnished by Ireland and Scotland and the recruits from the farms of Canada and Australia, the English armies in South Africa would long ago have been driven into the sea. The English soldier from England will no longer fight. Four hundred and fifty Boers attacked Spion Kop and killed and wounded 2,000 and drove those who were left to their defenses. The same story, wherever England has met white men for years, has been told. Fighting naked savages has become her business, the only business at which she is successful; and yet this work is the white man's burden, which we are asked to help bear.

England carries on these wars against the poorly armed people of Asia and Africa with the most cruel and savage barbarity. First the foe, often armed with old muzzle-loading rifles or spears, crowded together, without artillery, are mowed down by rapid-fire guns, and the survivors are demoralized. Then English mounted lancers charge the fleeing mass, overtaking individuals here and there and running them through the backs with their lances, keeping count of their victims and boasting of the number slain. Those left upon the field who are wounded are then murdered in cold blood. In the Soudan, in 1898, Kitchener fired upon crowds of women and children and killed hundreds at Omdurman.

"PIG STICKING" RELICS OF BARBARISM.

Why is the lance longer used in modern warfare? Why are English horsemen armed with lances, the remotest relic of barbarism in connection with war? It is simply for the fun of what they called, when the war opened with the Boers, "pig-sticking." Is it not time that the civilized nations of the world rose and stayed the course of this nation which carries the black flag and is engaged in the murder of our fellow-men throughout the world?

Here is a picture of the Soudan campaign of 1896, from Winston Churchill, in the London Post, September 29, 1898:

We had not gone far when individual dervishes began to walk toward the advancing squadrons, throwing down their weapons, holding up their hands, and imploring mercy. The laws of war do not admit the right of a beaten enemy to quarter.

The victor is not obliged to accept surrender. This is the new English doctrine of war. Churchill does not say what was done, but there is no doubt these supplicants for mercy were murdered on the spot.

Mr. E. N. Bennett, in the January Contemporary Review, related what he saw in the Soudan campaign:

All the wounded were killed and then robbed.

This slaughter of the wounded was not confined to Arab servants. It was stated that orders were given to kill the wounded. Certain it is no protest was made when scores of wounded were dispatched. The dervishes, who were stretched on the sands within a few yards, were bayoneted. Arabs, who lay further out in the desert from the line of march and happened to move or turn over in their agony, were instantly pierced with bullets. On some occasions shots were fired into the bodies of wounded men at such close quarters that the smell of burning flesh was sickening.

After the battle of Omdurman, Dervishes, who lay with shattered legs or arms, absolutely without weapons, were bayoneted and shot without mercy. Our own British soldiers took part in it. On the west slopes of Surgham I noticed a fine old Dervish, with a gray beard, who was disabled by a wound in his leg. About 8 yards from him was his son, a boy of 17, whose leg had also been lacerated by a bullet. Both were without arms, yet an Englishman stepped out of the ranks and drove his bayonet through the old man's chest. The old man begged in vain for mercy and clutched the soldier's bayonet, reddening his hands in his own blood in a vain attempt to prevent a second thrust. No effort was made by officers or men to prevent the murder, and the report was that General Kitchener had given orders to kill all wounded.

MURDERED AND ROBBED THE WOUNDED.

This is from an English correspondent, who relates what he saw with his own eyes:

No attempt was made for two days to do anything for the wounded Dervishes.

Except to murder and rob them.

General Kitchener returned from these terrible scenes with the blood of thousands of murdered men, women, and children on his hands, and urged Christian England to forget his barbarity and subscribe a fund to build a college at Khartoum to teach Christianity and English civilization. I can imagine the children, whose fathers and mothers had been thus barbarously murdered, flocking in numbers to become students of a civilization and a religion that had deprived them of their parents—and the justification for all this was that their purpose was to benefit and bless mankind.

Hear the canting Salisbury, at a dinner of the Constitutional Club, London, December 16, 1898. Referring to the Soudan campaign, he said:

The Empire is advancing and must advance. The great strength you have must be used unflinchingly, unsparingly, but still prudently, for the advancement of the interests of the Empire and for the benefit of mankind. That we have used the force intrusted to us not violently, not sentimentally, but with calm and courageous calculation for the advancement of the interests of the Empire and the benefits of the civilization of mankind.

RUM, OPIUM, BIBLES, AND HARLOTS MAKE A CARGO.

The cargo of an English ship starting to the Tropics on a mission of civilization and Christian mercy is made up of an assortment of merchandise, among which may be found rum and opium, with the Queen's stamp upon them. There are Bibles, English harlots, and the missionary to go before and open the way for the introduction of the rest of the cargo, until a colony is built up like Singapore and Hongkong. No wonder, with these experiences fresh in their minds, that the Asiatics do not embrace Christianity.

Our imperialistic friends and the President favor taking tropical colonies and holding them, after the English model, on the plea of duty to mankind, and the President employs fine passages of hypocritical cant borrowed from England's long experience. We are

told we should join England in her work and help bear the white man's burden. We are told that now is the moment when the destiny of Anglo-Saxon civilization hangs in the balance, and we must take up the burden and spread civilization and enlightenment and Christianity, after the English fashion, over that portion of the world not yet cursed by the blight of English presence; that England has been doing the work for a century, and now she falters and finds the burden too great to bear. Jealous rivals covet her empire and her dominions; that the great prize at stake for mankind is Anglo-Saxon dominion and lordship over the world; that dominion after the English fashion it is our duty to uphold; that it is God's work, and that He desires we should make England's struggle our own. And so imbued has the President become with this idea that he has pursued a course that has led the whole world to believe he has made at least a verbal alliance with Great Britain to render aid, if occasion requires. The effect of our attitude has been to prevent the nations of Europe from helping the South African republics.

THIS IS OUR PLAIN DUTY.

Therefore our duty is plain. We should pass this resolution of sympathy with these struggling Republics. We should show the world that England can not rely upon us for support in any form. We should encourage and counsel with her enemies. We should show to the whole world that we condemn her course in South Africa.

I spurn an English alliance and English sympathy. I want nothing to do with that nation of robbers and murderers, unless it be to join the other nations of the earth in a notice to England that she must close her career of piracy, must pull down her black flag, and withdraw her armed forces from all her colonies and allow them to be free. Rather than join in this unholy work, called by that poet of blood "the white man's burden," let us emulate the example of our forefathers and be again the champions of all men struggling to be free, the example to the world, the proof to mankind that a nation of freemen can do right, can be just, can resist the temptation to conquer and oppress, and that we hate injustice. Let us exhibit the example of a government conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and demonstrate that this Government, so conceived and so dedicated, a government of, for, and by the people, shall not perish from the earth.



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 019 920 720 9

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 019 920 720 9